

Inclusive Education in Rural Philippine Schools: Examining Teacher Practices and Challenges

Arniel B. Jamito

Kinan-oan High School, Bohol, Philippines

Abstract. Inclusive education remains a challenge in Philippine schools. This study examines inclusive education in rural public elementary schools by focusing on teacher practices, implementation challenges, and latent dimensions of pedagogy. Using a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, data were gathered from 208 teachers and selected interview participants in the Sub-Congressional District III of Bohol, Philippines. Findings show that inclusive education practices are generally highly implemented, particularly in classroom management, instructional materials, and teacher preparation, while strategies and methodologies are comparatively less developed. Teachers demonstrate consistent engagement in planning, resource use, and classroom structuring, but encounter difficulties in differentiated instruction, managing diverse learner needs, and sustaining pedagogical confidence. Major challenges include limited instructional resources, insufficient training in special education, time constraints, and emotional stress in handling heterogeneous classrooms. Despite these constraints, teachers employ adaptive strategies such as collaborative learning, contextualized instruction, and individualized support. The paper further develops an interpretive account of adaptive inclusion, suggesting that teachers may sustain inclusion through informal and context-dependent adjustments that are not fully captured by standardized measures. Overall, the paper concludes that inclusive education in rural contexts is shaped by a tension between policy expectations and situated classroom realities, with teachers sustaining inclusion through formal practices and adaptive responses to local constraints.

Keywords: inclusive education; teacher practices; rural schools; teaching challenges; mixed-methods research

Introduction

In 1994, a meeting organized by the government of Spain in cooperation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), gathered delegates from over ninety countries and multiple international organizations produced The Salamanca Statement which identified the “necessity and urgency of providing education for children, youth and adults with special educational needs within the regular education system” (UNESCO, 1994, p. viii). Congruent with this, Philippine legislation has been produced, such as RA 11650, 10533, and 7277, which mandate inclusive systems, resource provision, and professional development, while

Department of Education policies operationalize inclusion across diverse learner groups. However, despite these strong legal foundations, gaps remain in implementation, particularly in resource allocation, teacher preparation, and societal attitudes toward disability. The sustainability of inclusive education remains central to the realization of Sustainable Development Goal 4, particularly in geographically and materially constrained rural contexts.

Notwithstanding the wealth of literature on inclusive education, there is still a need to study its configurations in rural contexts, given the diagnosis that contemporary education research has remained urban-normative and still has little language for communities defined by distance, isolation, sparse infrastructure, or geographic separation, exemplified by rural schools (Thier & Beach, 2019). In the Philippines, inclusive education remains a continuing challenge because implementation is often constrained by limited resources and inadequate institutional support (Muega, 2016). While policies and programs upholding inclusive education are gradually being put in place in developing countries, research on its actual implementation remains characterized by persistent gaps in evidence and practice (Srivastava, De Boer, & Pijl, 2015; Mendoza & Heymann, 2024).

Being situated in a rural context apparently provides enabling conditions for emancipatory pedagogy. Yet evidence from rural Spain reveals that inclusion in rural schools has often remained performative. Although rural schools possess “chronological heterogeneity and a lower ratio,” maintain “close relationship[s] with the education community,” and historically “helped students connect to their environment,” actual classroom practice may still rely heavily on standardized approaches and limited methodological transformation (Moreno et al., 2015, p. 110).

A central crisis of contemporary educational reform is how “the meaning of inclusion” is transformed into an administrative vocabulary detached from actual classroom realities (Moreno et al., 2015, p. 110). Muega (2016) further argues that the problem of inclusive education in the Philippines is fundamentally structural rather than merely individual. Hence, the narratives of teachers regarding their practices and challenges in attempting to become inclusive remain important to examine.

In relation to this, the researcher was inspired to study the practices employed by teachers in inclusive education and to identify the challenges they experience that adversely affect their teaching performance, to inform the development of a possible action plan. This study aims to determine the practices and challenges in inclusive education among selected public elementary teachers in the Sub-Congressional District III of Bohol for School

Year 2023–2024. Specifically, it sought to (1) determine the level of inclusive education practices across domains; (2) describe variations in practices across domains; (3) test whether significant differences exist among domains; (4) narrate the experiences of teachers in practicing inclusive education; and (5) identify the teachers’ challenges in the practice of inclusive education.

Literature Background

Theoretical perspectives on inclusive education converge on the importance of structured yet responsive teaching. Vygotsky’s framework emphasizes guided participation through the zone of proximal development and scaffolding, positioning teacher support as a mechanism for fostering independence and engagement (Vygotsky, 1978). Merrill’s Component Display Theory likewise foregrounds learner control and instructional adaptability, reinforcing the need for individualized learning pathways (Merrill, 1983).

Empirical studies reveal persistent structural and pedagogical constraints in inclusive education. Teachers frequently lack formal training in special education, adequate materials, and institutional support, leading to feelings of unpreparedness and ineffective inclusion practices (Allam & Martin, 2021). These difficulties are compounded by the complex needs of learners, requiring teachers to adapt instructional strategies and classroom management practices continuously.

Beyond the classroom, inclusion is also shaped by institutional and community contexts. Strong parental engagement and collaboration with stakeholders contribute to improved learner outcomes and more responsive instructional strategies, while insufficient support structures increase the burden placed upon teachers. As such, inclusive education requires sustained collaboration among teachers, school administrators, parents, and the broader community.

Behavioral management also remains a significant concern in inclusive settings. Teachers often encounter disruptive behavior, difficulties in sustaining learner engagement, and challenges in maintaining classroom order. Consequently, inclusive teaching involves not only instructional adaptation but also emotional resilience and effective classroom management.

Despite these constraints, evidence suggests that appropriate instructional strategies and contextualized approaches can yield meaningful gains in learner participation, communication, and academic performance. This includes differentiated instruction, collaborative learning,

contextualized teaching, and innovative pedagogical approaches such as the flipped classroom strategy (Altemueller & Lindquist, 2017; Pandan, Honculada, & Tabaranza, 2025; Tonegawa, 2021).

Taken together, the literature suggests that inclusive education operates through a persistent contradiction: policy frameworks assume institutional readiness for inclusion, yet actual implementation often depends upon teachers improvising under conditions of limited training, scarce resources, and pedagogical overload.

Methods

This study employed the convergent parallel mixed-methods design in which quantitative and qualitative data were collected simultaneously but analyzed separately, and the results were merged during interpretation. Quantitative data from a modified instrument and qualitative data from open-ended interview responses were utilized to provide detailed and comprehensive information addressing the research objectives and questions.

The locale of the study consisted of four municipalities in the Sub-Congressional District III of Bohol Province, where teachers practicing inclusive education were identified.

This study used purposive sampling, considering that respondents were selected based on their experience in handling learners with special educational needs. A total of 208 public elementary teachers participated in the quantitative phase, while selected experienced teachers participated in face-to-face interviews for the qualitative component.

The study utilized a modified instrument adapted from Allam and Martin (2021) to determine the level of teachers' practices in terms of teacher preparation, instructional materials, strategies and methodologies, and classroom management. A researcher-made interview guide was also used to identify teachers' experiences and challenges in practicing inclusive education.

Permission to conduct the study was secured from the concerned university officials and the Schools Division Superintendent. Respondents were informed about the purpose of the study and assured of the confidentiality of their responses.

After data collection, the responses were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted. Weighted means were interpreted using a four-point scale ranging from 1 ("Not Practiced at All") to 4 ("Highly Practiced").

Results

This section integrates quantitative and qualitative data in order to provide a comprehensive interpretation of inclusive education practices and challenges among public elementary teachers in rural schools of Sub-Congressional District III, Bohol.

Level of Inclusive Education Practices.

The first objective examined the overall level of teachers' inclusive education practices in terms of four domains: teacher preparation, instructional materials, strategies and methodologies, and classroom management. Inclusive education practices among teachers are generally substantially evident, with a composite mean of 3.33. This suggests that teachers consistently demonstrate engagement in inclusive teaching behaviors, particularly in foundational and classroom-facing dimensions of instruction.

Among the four domains, classroom management obtained the highest composite mean (3.45), followed closely by instructional materials (3.40) and teacher preparation (3.33), all interpreted as highly practiced. In contrast, strategies and methodologies obtained the lowest composite mean (3.15), interpreted as moderately practiced, indicating relative difficulty in fully operationalizing differentiated pedagogical approaches.

These results indicate that inclusive education is strongest in structural and routine teaching dimensions (rules, preparation, materials organization), but comparatively weaker in instructional adaptability and pedagogical flexibility, which are central to inclusion.

Level of practices across each domain of inclusive education

Teacher preparation. This emerged as a highly practiced domain, anchored on routine planning behaviors such as lesson preparation, schedule management, and early classroom readiness. The highest indicator was maintaining a well-ventilated classroom (WM = 3.74), reflecting teachers' attention to physical learning conditions. However, lower-rated indicators such as "ability to deal with learners experiencing challenges" (WM = 2.64) and reviewing special education curriculum guides (WM = 2.77) reveal that while general preparation is strong, specialized preparedness for diverse learners remains limited. Qualitative findings support this pattern. Teachers described preparation as extending beyond lesson planning to include learner assessment and adaptation of activities using tools such as the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) and Multi-Factored Assessment Tools. This shows emerging responsiveness, yet also highlights

dependence on individual initiative rather than structured institutional support.

Instructional materials. These were also highly practiced overall (composite mean = 3.40). Teachers frequently selected and prepared appropriate teaching aids (WM = 3.63), used ICT resources, and integrated multimedia tools. However, incorporating materials suited for diverse learner needs obtained the lowest rating (WM = 2.73), indicating a gap in material differentiation. This suggests that while teachers are competent in selecting instructional resources, they face constraints in customizing materials for varied learner profiles, particularly in inclusive settings where differentiation is essential. Qualitative data confirm that teachers attempt to adapt materials using visual aids, simulations, and contextual resources, but are limited by availability and time constraints.

Strategies and Methodologies. This domain recorded the lowest composite mean (3.15), indicating moderate practice. The strongest practice was collaborative learning (WM = 3.56), showing teachers' preference for interactive and group-based strategies. However, significant challenges are evident in more complex inclusive practices, such as (1) teaching learners with severe difficulties (WM = 2.74), (2) managing unpredictable behavior (WM = 2.74), and (3) teacher confidence in methods (WM = 2.60). These findings indicate that while teachers employ participatory strategies, they experience difficulty in differentiating instruction for high-need learners and maintaining pedagogical confidence. Qualitative findings further explain this gap. Teachers described using active learning, group work, and technology integration, but also expressed uncertainty when addressing learners requiring intensive support. This reflects a gap in inclusive pedagogy, where collaboration is strong but differentiation is still developing.

Classroom Management. This emerged as the strongest domain (composite mean = 3.45). Teachers consistently imposed rules (WM = 3.85), created positive classroom environments (WM = 3.80), and used reinforcement strategies such as praise and rewards. However, communication-related challenges were evident, particularly in managing learner expectations (WM = 2.69) and maintaining authority without compromising rapport. Qualitative data show that teachers actively establish structured and supportive environments but struggle with behavioral communication complexities, especially when learners exhibit misaligned expectations or emotional responses. Overall, classroom management is

highly developed, suggesting that teachers rely heavily on structure, reinforcement, and control to sustain inclusion.

Consistent with Inclusive Education Practices among Domains

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether significant differences existed among the four domains of inclusive education practices: teacher preparation, instructional materials, strategies and methodologies, and classroom management. The analysis indicated that the differences among the domain means were not statistically significant, suggesting that the observed variations in practice were not sufficient to establish a statistically significant difference across domains. Thus, while the descriptive results show that some domains received higher mean ratings than others, these differences should be interpreted as variations in reported levels of practice rather than evidence that one domain was implemented significantly more than another.

Teachers' Experiences in Practicing Inclusive Education

The thematic analysis generated four major themes describing how teachers operationalized inclusive education in rural public elementary schools: (1) responsive instructional planning; (2) creating supportive learning environments; (3) contextualized and assistive instructional resources; and (4) differentiated and collaborative instruction.

Theme 1: Responsive Instructional Planning. Teachers emphasized the importance of advance preparation, learner assessment, and instructional adaptation in implementing inclusive education. One participant explained:

“In terms of preparation for my teaching process, especially for my learner with special needs, I revisited the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) in the simplification of activities, identified the learning gaps, and assessed the learner using the Multi-Factored Assessment Tool (MFAT) if the learner can attain my expected activity. Then, this is the time that I will draft a plan of activities.” (Teacher 1)

This finding demonstrates that inclusive planning extends beyond routine lesson preparation toward individualized instructional adjustment. Teachers actively attempted to align activities with learner capacity and readiness, suggesting an awareness that standardized instruction alone may not sufficiently address learner diversity. Another teacher further emphasized the importance of comprehensive preparation:

“I prepared a very comprehensive daily lesson plan, power point presentation for each lesson, activity sheets; conducted summative test every week; and engaged some activities that build confidence of my learners.” (Teacher 5)

The findings indicate that teachers viewed planning as both an instructional and emotional support mechanism. Lesson preparation was not solely directed toward content delivery but also toward building learner participation and confidence.

Theme 2: Creating Supportive Learning Environments. Teachers also emphasized the importance of establishing physically and emotionally supportive classroom environments. One participant noted:

“I ensured that, the learning environment is conducive to learning where the learners feel comfortable and secured. Because I’ve experienced when my learner with disability was far from the wall fan, he became restless and had the tendency to throw things near him.” (Teacher 8)

This finding highlight how classroom environment directly shapes learner regulation, comfort, and participation. The statement also demonstrates that teachers interpreted inclusion not only in pedagogical terms but also through attention to environmental and sensory conditions affecting learner behavior. The findings reinforce research suggesting that inclusive classrooms require flexible and supportive physical arrangements capable of accommodating learner variability (Weinstein, 1979).

Theme 3: Contextualized and Assistive Instructional Resources. Teachers described carefully selecting and organizing instructional resources responsive to learner needs. As one participant stated:

“I carefully select and organize instructional materials such as textbooks, visual aids, and multimedia resources, evaluate and update, align with the curriculum objectives and student needs.” (Teacher 6)

The findings suggest that teachers attempted to contextualize materials despite limited resources. The use of multimedia, visual aids, and adaptive materials reflects efforts to enhance accessibility and learner engagement in resource-constrained environments.

Theme 4: Differentiated and Collaborative Instruction. Teachers also described employing varied instructional strategies to sustain learner participation:

“I employed a variety of interactive teaching strategies and methodologies, such as active learning, group discussions, hands-on activities, and technology integration to promote student engagement, critical thinking, and knowledge retention.” (Teacher 2)

This finding demonstrates that inclusive instruction relied heavily upon interaction, participation, and collaborative engagement. Teachers appeared to recognize that passive instructional approaches may inadequately address diverse learner needs. Overall, the qualitative findings suggest that teachers operationalized inclusion through continuous adaptation, flexibility, and contextual decision-making rather than through rigid adherence to standardized procedures.

Challenges Teachers Encounter in the Practice of Inclusive Education

Three major themes emerged regarding the challenges experienced by teachers: (1) time and resource constraints; (2) lack of training and professional development; and (3) emotional and psychological stress.

Time and Resource Constraints. Teachers consistently identified insufficient time and limited instructional resources as major barriers to inclusion. One participant shared that preparing differentiated instruction became difficult because learners possessed “different conditions, needs, skills, strengths, weaknesses, and behaviors.” The findings indicate that inclusive teaching significantly increases instructional demands upon teachers, particularly in multilevel classrooms where individualized adaptation is necessary. Resource scarcity further intensified these challenges, especially in rural contexts characterized by limited access to specialized materials and assistive technologies.

Lack of Training and Professional Development. Participants also emphasized inadequate preparation for handling learners with special educational needs. One teacher explained:

“It is very challenging to teach learners with special needs because concrete result is not well observed due to different levels of learners in the class, limited access to specialized

materials and assistive technologies, lack of teacher training, and not enough time in applying differentiated instructions especially different activities to be accomplished by the pupils.” (Teacher 7)

This finding reflects a broader structural issue in inclusive education implementation. Teachers are expected to operationalize inclusion despite insufficient professional preparation and limited institutional support. The challenge therefore extends beyond individual teacher competence toward systemic inadequacies in training and resource provision.

Emotional and Psychological Stress. Teachers also described emotional exhaustion associated with balancing diverse learner needs while regulating classroom behavior. One participant noted:

“I am challenged in balancing individual student needs since they have different levels and backgrounds. When the pupil is displaying defiant behavior, I cannot provide emotional support while I also manage my own emotions and stress.”
(Teacher 2)

The findings demonstrate that inclusive teaching involves substantial emotional labor. Teachers not only manage instructional adaptation but also negotiate behavioral, emotional, and interpersonal complexities within the classroom. These demands can generate psychological strain, especially when institutional support systems remain weak. Overall, the findings suggest that the principal barriers to inclusive education are structural rather than merely individual. Teachers demonstrated willingness to implement inclusive practices, yet their efforts were constrained by insufficient resources, inadequate training, and the emotional burden associated with sustaining inclusive classrooms.

Theorizing Beyond the Reported Practices: Toward an Ecology of Adaptive Inclusion

The findings of this study already establish that inclusive education in rural schools is characterized by a persistent negotiation between structured pedagogical effort and material as well as institutional constraints. However, what remains analytically significant are the latent practices and unarticulated challenges that likely operate beneath the visible layer of teacher-reported strategies and questionnaire-identified behaviors.

These are not contradictions of the findings, but rather their extension into the “silent curriculum” of rural inclusive schooling—what teachers do but do not always formalize, quantify, or explicitly narrate (Gibson, 2006). The following discussion does not claim direct empirical measurement of these latent practices. Rather, it offers a theoretically informed interpretive extension of the findings, drawing from the convergence of quantitative patterns, participant narratives, and existing literature on rural inclusive education.

While the study identifies differentiated instruction and collaborative learning as moderately practiced strategies, a more informal and improvisational economy of differentiation probably exists in daily classroom life (Corbett, 2013). Teachers in rural inclusive classrooms often engage in micro-adjustments that escape formal documentation: simplifying oral instructions mid-lesson, translating tasks into local linguistic registers, or quietly reducing task expectations for specific learners without revising written plans.

These practices rarely appear in Likert-scale instruments or even in interviews because they are often perceived not as “strategies,” but as instinctive teaching adjustments. Yet, in reality, they constitute a form of invisible pedagogy of survival where inclusion is sustained not through designed differentiation models but through moment-to-moment improvisation (Becker, 2012). This suggests that the moderately rated strategies and methodologies domain may not reflect the absence of practice, but rather the presence of undocumented pedagogical micro-actions that are cognitively and emotionally absorbed into teaching routines.

Another unreported layer of practice likely involves what may be called shadow inclusion mechanisms (Sharma & Kaur, 2024). In resource-constrained classrooms, inclusion is often indirectly sustained through peer-mediated learning that is not formally structured as cooperative learning. High-performing students are quietly tasked with explaining lessons, managing the behavior of struggling peers, or even completing partial instructional mediation on behalf of the teacher.

While the study captures collaborative learning as a practiced strategy, it does not fully capture the asymmetrical peer dependency structure and thus ableism that often underpins inclusion in multilevel rural classrooms (Lalvani & Osieja, 2025). In this configuration, inclusion is partially redistributed away from institutional scaffolding toward learner-to-learner labor. This raises a conceptual tension: inclusion is formally a pedagogical responsibility of the teacher, but functionally it becomes a distributed survival mechanism across the classroom social structure.

The study identifies emotional and psychological stress as a major challenge, but this category likely underrepresents the depth and duration of emotional labor embedded in inclusive teaching (Horner, et al., 2020). Beyond episodic stress responses, teachers may engage in continuous affective regulation: suppressing frustration during repeated behavioral disruptions, performing emotional neutrality in the presence of learning stagnation, and maintaining motivational speech even in conditions of instructional failure.

What is not fully captured is the possibility that teachers also experience a form of emotional compartmentalization, where emotional strain is deferred until non-teaching moments (Carson, 2006). This includes after-class rumination, silent exhaustion, and moral fatigue that are not easily expressed in structured interviews due to professional identity expectations. In this sense, emotional stress is not only an outcome but a continuous condition of pedagogical presence in inclusive classrooms.

Although the study references structural constraints, an additional layer may exist in the form of procedural compliance inclusion (Voulgarides, 2018). Teachers may fulfill administrative requirements for inclusion—lesson plans, documentation, individualized plans—without these necessarily translating into meaningful instructional differentiation.

This creates a subtle divergence between documented inclusion and experienced exclusion, where learners are formally included in records but only partially engaged in practice due to time constraints and instructional overload (Done & Andrews, 2020). Such a gap is rarely reported directly by teachers because it implicates institutional accountability structures. Thus, what appears as “highly practiced” domains may partially reflect compliance-driven reporting rather than full pedagogical realization.

Another underexplored practice is what may be described as silent curriculum reduction. Teachers, constrained by time and learner variability, may progressively narrow the curriculum content delivered to ensure baseline comprehension among the majority of learners (Nevenglosky, 2018). This results in a form of instructional compression where curriculum objectives are informally prioritized, reordered, or partially omitted.

This practice is rarely acknowledged because it conflicts with official expectations of curriculum fidelity. However, in inclusive rural classrooms, it may function as a pragmatic response to heterogeneity. The implication is that inclusion is sustained not only through adaptation, but also through strategic curricular contraction, a form of pedagogical triage that prioritizes survival of learning over completeness of coverage.

The study identifies resource constraints, but does not fully elaborate on the extent to which inclusion is shaped by micro-adaptations to infrastructure instability—a phenomenon pervasive in the Philippine experience (Preña & Labayo, 2025). These include adjusting lesson pacing due to heat conditions, reorganizing seating based on sunlight exposure, or suspending activities due to intermittent power or material shortages.

Such adaptations are not typically conceptualized as “inclusive education practices,” yet they directly determine participation and engagement, especially for learners with sensory, behavioral, or cognitive needs. Inclusion in rural contexts is therefore also ecologically negotiated, contingent on physical and environmental fluctuations.

Finally, there is a likely form of unreported practice that can be described as professional self-restriction. Teachers, aware of institutional limitations, may consciously avoid attempting certain inclusive strategies—such as intensive individualized instruction or complex assistive interventions—not because they are unaware of them, but because they anticipate their unsustainability within existing workloads (Torres, 2016; Ballet & Kelchtermans, 2009).

This form of anticipatory restraint is significant because it shapes the actual ceiling of inclusive practice. It suggests that the limitation is not only external (resources, training), but also internalized as professional boundary-setting under constraint. Over time, this may normalize a “bounded inclusion,” where teachers operate within a self-defined zone of feasible intervention.

Taken together, these latent dimensions suggest that inclusive education in rural schools is less a fixed set of observable practices and more a situated improvisational system. What the study captures as “highly practiced” domains are only the visible crystallizations of a deeper layer of adaptive labor that is fragmented, informal, and often cognitively absorbed rather than explicitly articulated.

Thus, the central implication is that inclusion in rural contexts should not be understood solely through declared competencies or measured domains, but through the ecology of adaptation—where teachers continuously negotiate between policy expectations, learner diversity, infrastructural limits, and emotional sustainability.

In this sense, what remains “unreported” is simply distributed across time, habit, and survival-oriented pedagogical decisions that resist easy categorization.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study examined the practices and challenges of public elementary teachers implementing inclusive education in rural schools in Congressional District III of Bohol during School Year 2023–2024. The study demonstrates that rural teachers sustain inclusive education not because structural conditions are fully supportive, but because teachers continuously adapt their practices despite institutional and material limitations.

Findings revealed that inclusive education practices were generally highly implemented, particularly in classroom management, instructional materials, and teacher preparation, while strategies and methodologies were implemented at a comparatively lower level. Teachers consistently practiced structured preparation, lesson planning, classroom organization, and the use of instructional materials adapted to learner needs.

The study further found that teachers in rural inclusive classrooms relied heavily on practical and adaptive strategies such as differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, interactive activities, behavior management, and contextualized classroom support. Despite these practices, teachers encountered persistent structural and pedagogical constraints, including limited instructional resources, insufficient training in special education, time constraints, difficulties in addressing diverse learner needs, and emotional stress associated with managing challenging classroom situations.

Qualitative findings showed that teachers attempted to sustain inclusive practices through individualized planning, classroom flexibility, and continuous adjustment of teaching approaches. Quantitative findings further revealed no statistically significant difference among the examined dimensions of inclusive education practice, suggesting that inclusive practices were implemented with relative consistency across teacher preparation, instructional materials, strategies and methodologies, and classroom management.

Schools must take steps to reverse the diagnosis that “rural areas do not take full advantage of the context they are in to favour inclusion processes” (Moreno et al., 2015, p. 107). The Division of Bohol of the Department of Education may organize continuous professional development opportunities on inclusion strategies of learners with special educational needs (Pinili et al., 2024). The findings suggest that professional development initiatives should move beyond generalized inclusion seminars toward practice-oriented training focused on differentiated instruction, behavioral communication, curriculum adaptation, and emotionally sustainable classroom management. The Division of Bohol of the

Department of Education must provide human and material resources for the implementation of inclusive education. The Department of Education may provide more adequate resources, equipment, and teaching materials for learners with diverse learning needs. The school head and other stakeholders may be encouraged to strongly support in creating an active organization. Future researchers in the field of teaching may use the findings as a basis for future study to improve their teaching practices and to overcome challenges in teaching in inclusive education.

References

- Allam, F. C., & Martin, M. M. (2021). Issues and challenges in special education: A qualitative analysis from teacher's perspective. *Southeast Asia Early Childhood Journal*, 10(1), 37–49.
- Altemueller, L., & Lindquist, C. (2017). Flipped classroom instruction for inclusive learning. *British Journal of Special Education*, 44(3), 341–358.
- Ballet, K., & Kelchtermans, G. (2009). Struggling with workload: Primary teachers' experience of intensification. *Teaching and teacher education*, 25(8), 1150–1157.
- Becker, T. (2012). Evaluating improvisation as a technique for training pre-service teachers for inclusive classrooms (Publication No. 2491) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida]. <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/2491>.
- Carson III, R. L. (2006). Exploring the episodic nature of teachers' emotions as it relates to teacher burnout. Purdue University.
- Corbett, M. (2013). Improvisation as a curricular metaphor: Imagining education for a rural creative class. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 28(10).
- Done, E. J., & Andrews, M. J. (2020). How inclusion became exclusion: Policy, teachers and inclusive education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 35(4), 447–464.
- Gibson, S. (2006). Beyond a 'culture of silence': inclusive education and the liberation of 'voice'. *Disability & society*, 21(4), 315–329.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1994). An overview of cooperative learning. In J. S. Thousand, R. A. Villa, & A. I. Nevin (Eds.), *Creativity and collaborative learning* (pp. 31–43). Brookes.
- Lalvani, P., & Osieja, E. (2025). Battle fatigue: Parents, institutionalized ableism, and the "fight" for inclusive education. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 50(1), 19–35.
- Horner, C. G., Brown, E. L., Mehta, S., & Scanlon, C. L. (2020). Feeling and acting like a teacher: Reconceptualizing teachers' emotional labor. *Teachers College Record*, 122(5), 1–36.
- Mendoza, M., & Heymann, J. (2024). Implementation of inclusive education: A systematic review of studies of inclusive education interventions in low-and lower-middle-income countries. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 71(3), 299–316.
- Merrill, M. D. (1983). Component Display Theory. In C. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional Design Theories and Models*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Moreno, J. A., Molina Jaén, M. D., Pérez Navío, E., & Rodríguez Moreno, J. (2015). Inclusive education in schools in rural areas. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 4(2), 107–114.

- Muega, M. A. G. (2016). Inclusive education in the Philippines: Through the eyes of teachers, administrators, and parents of children with special needs. *Social Science Diliman*, 12(1), 5–28.
- Nevenglosky, E. A. (2018). Barriers to effective curriculum implementation (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Pandan, M. S., Honculada, C., & Tabaranza, C. (2025). Flipped Classroom Approach as an Effective Teaching Strategy in a Science High School. *Pamulingan: KCAST Journal of Natural and Cultural Sciences*, 1(1), 1–8.
- Pinili, L., Almerino Jr, P., Tenerife, J. J., Evangelista, S. S., Almerino, J. G., Aro, J. L., ... & Ocampo, L. (2024). Uncertain causality analysis of critical success factors of special education mathematics teaching. *Open Education Studies*, 6(1), 20220232.
- Preña, E. M., & Labayo, C. P. (2025). Policy responses to extreme heat and its impact on education: The Philippine experience. *Policy Futures in Education*, 23(3), 652–675.
- Sharma, D., & Kaur, S. (2024). Exploring Shadow Education Practices: Implications for Educational Equity and Social Justice. *Journal of Education*, 14, 34.
- Srivastava, M., De Boer, A., & Pijl, S. J. (2015). Inclusive education in developing countries: A closer look at its implementation in the last 10 years. *Educational Review*, 67(2), 179–195.
- Thier, M., & Beach, P. (2019). Stories we don't tell: Research's limited accounting of rural schools. *School Leadership Review*, 14(2), 5.
- Tonegawa, Y. (2021). Contextualization of inclusive education: Education for children with disabilities in Myanmar. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(1), 365–380.
- Torres, A. C. (2016). Is this work sustainable? Teacher turnover and perceptions of workload in charter management organizations. *Urban Education*, 51(8), 891–914.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education: Adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education, Salamanca, Spain, 7–10 June 1994 (ED-94/WS/18)*. UNESCO.
- Voulgarides, C. (2018). *Does compliance matter in special education?: IDEA and the hidden inequities of practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1979). The physical environment of the school: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(4), 577–610.